

The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

VOL. 9, NO. 38

Lincoln, Nebraska, October 1, 1909

Whole Number 454

THE BIG BATTLE IN TEXAS

"Mr. Bryan is trying to secure harmony in the only way in which harmony can be secured, namely by securing united action on a definite policy. If the advocates of a tariff on lumber, iron ore, wool, etc., can convert the whole party let them do so, and we will then have harmony, but must the rest of us keep quiet while they work?"

The Houston (Texas) Post accuses Mr. Bryan of trying to divide the party because he defends the doctrine of free raw material. The Post says:

"It is but fair to Mr. Bryan to tell him that the democrats of the south are not going to follow him to the lengths he proposes, as much as they admire him, and if his latest invasion turns out to be a campaign against individuals, as those who are now applauding him assert, he will find in the end that he has accomplished nothing for the democratic party but factional strife, nothing for the sane reforms he has espoused but indefinite delay, nothing for himself but a diminishing public regard. It is not for the Post to suggest Mr. Bryan's course of action. He knows what he is about, even if he fails to realize the probable ultimate effect of his campaign. But the Post knows he is disappointing scores of thousands of men who have always rallied to his cause when his political fortunes were at stake, and they are going to take leave of him if forced to the choice which he seems determined to submit to their consideration."

How soon blindness overtakes a man when

he begins to put the pecuniary interests of a few above the rights of the many!

Dividing the party? Was it in the interest of harmony that a Texas convention condemned the only democratic tariff law enacted since the war?

Was it in the interest of harmony that the protectionist democrats raised an issue that divided our party in congress, and even in Texas?

On how many questions did the Texas delegation vote solidly? The two senators differed on lumber and iron ore, and the Texas delegation in congress differed on both lumber and hides.

Let the Post poll the Texas delegation on the platform suggested by Mr. Bryan at Dallas and it will find that the party is already divided. In several other states protection has manifested itself among democrats who represent districts in which there are powerful corporations demanding special favors. The divisions among our democrats in the senate and house have greatly impaired our

chances of controlling the next congress, and if we control the next congress we can not agree on a tariff law as long as these difficulties exist.

Mr. Bryan is trying to secure harmony in the only way in which harmony can be secured, namely, by securing united action on a definite policy. If the advocates of a tariff on lumber, iron ore, wool, etc., can convert the whole party let them do so, and we will then have harmony, but must the rest of us keep quiet while they work?

The Post will find that the saw mill interests can not bring the whole party to favor a tariff on lumber—they can not control a majority of the Texas delegation. Will a majority of the Texas delegation favor a tariff on iron ore? Will a majority oppose the proposed plank, "Free hides, free leather, free harness, free boots and free shoes?"

Let the Post be frank and confess that it is more anxious to protect a few rich producers of raw material than it is in harmony or in guarding the interests of the masses.

MR. BRYAN'S EL PASO INTERVIEW

Mr. Bryan gave the following interview at El Paso, Texas. In answer to an inquiry from one of the local papers as to whether he had anything to say in regard to Senator Bailey's Dallas speech, he replied:

I read Senator Bailey's Dallas speech on the train this morning as I was coming into El Paso. It is an able presentation of his position—as able a presentation as can be made, and I am very glad to have his side of the proposition presented by one who can put the best appearance upon it, for when the voters of Texas have

read it, they will know that nothing better can be said in defense of a tax on raw material, and as he has not answered my arguments, the voters will have a right to assume that no one else can. His speech does not require an answer in detail. I may, in future speeches refer to particular arguments he advances, but all that needs to be said now can be said very briefly in this interview.

Senator Bailey does not attempt to meet several of my arguments and he does not fairly present some of the others. His misinterpretation of history is surprising. He says that we were defeated in the congressional election of 1894 because the doctrine of free raw material was embodied in the Wilson bill. He certainly has not forgotten that the defeat in 1894 was due to the fact that the silver question divided our party at that time and that a majority of our party opposed the position taken by the democratic administration on the unconditional repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law. And, further, if he will examine the election returns of 1894, he will find that about the only districts that we carried were districts in those portions of the country in which he says the people resent the doctrine of free raw material, while we lost the districts in those portions of the country where they have practically no raw material to protect. He also overlooks the fact that in 1892 we elected a democratic president and secured a large democratic majority in congress on a platform

which endorsed the doctrine of free raw material, and he will remember also that we won that victory after the house of representatives of the Fifty-second congress had passed several free raw material bills, for which both he and I voted. Is it necessary to overlook entirely a national victory and to misinterpret a congressional defeat in order to find support of the senator's theory?

Senator Bailey says that the national platform of 1896 was in harmony with the Texas platform of that year, and he demands the right to construe the tariff plank on the ground that he wrote it. That is the position taken by the Aldrich republicans in regard to the last republican national platform. They demand the right to construe the word "revise" because they inserted it in the platform, but the western republicans insist that they also have a right to construe the word "revise," and they construe it as a promise of reduction. The words which Mr. Bailey inserted in the democratic national platform of 1896 do not appear in the Texas state platform; neither do the words "raw material," which were in the state platform, appear in the national platform. He construes the platform as an attack on free raw material, but it was not so construed in other parts of the country.

As to the binding force of platforms, he does not meet the proposition which I presented. He discusses whether he should be bound by a national platform made after his election, and

CONTENTS

THE BIG BATTLE IN TEXAS
MR. BRYAN'S EL PASO INTERVIEW
MR. BRYAN'S TARIFF PLANKS
THE DEMOCRATIC TARIFF POLICY
DROPPING THE MASK
THE NEBRASKA ELECTION
MR. BAILEY'S SPEECHES
NORTH POLE LITERATURE
REVISION FOR THE EDITORS
THE NEW YORK DEMOCRATIC LEAGUE
CURRENT TOPICS
WESTERN OPINION OF MR. TAFT'S EN-
DORSEMENT OF ALDRICHISM
LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE
HOME DEPARTMENT
WHETHER COMMON OR NOT
NEWS OF THE WEEK